1 (In open court) THE COURT: Good morning, please be seated everyone. 2 3 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, starting with the 4 government, please state your name for the record. MS. MORTAZAVI: Good morning, your Honor. Sarah 5 6 Mortazavi present for the government. And with me at counsel 7 table is Andrew Adams, and from the FBI, Special Agent Timothy 8 Bergen. 9 THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Mortazavi, Mr. Adams and 10 Mr. Bergen. 11 MR. KREISS: Good morning, your Honor. Jason Kreiss 12 on behalf of Jorge Navarro, who is seated to my left. 13 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Kreiss and Mr. Navarro. 14 THE DEFENDANT: Good morning. 15 THE COURT: Good morning too to our court reporter. 16 Thank you for being here. 17 So good morning everyone, as you know, I'm Judge 18 Vyskocil, we're here this morning for the purpose of sentencing 19 Mr. Navarro. Before we proceed, Mr. Navarro, I just want to 20 confirm -- I believe you told me at the time of your plea --21 you do speak and understand English clearly? 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: You do not need an interpreter? 24 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Ms. Mortazavi, are you taking the lead

this morning?

MS. MORTAZAVI: Yes, your Honor, I am.

THE COURT: Have any victims who are entitled to notice been provided with notice of today's proceeding?

MS. MORTAZAVI: Yes, your Honor. They have all been notified.

THE COURT: Thank you.

As everyone is aware, Mr. Navarro pleaded guilty on August 11th of this year pursuant to an agreement with the government to one count of conspiracy to commit drug adulteration and misbranding in violation of Title 18 United States Code §371. Since that time, the probation office has completed its investigation and the parties have filed with the Court their sentencing submissions.

The following documents have been received and are part of the record in this matter: The Court has received the final presentence report filed on November 4th, 2021, and that is on the docket at ECF 550. That final report reflects that certain revisions were made by mutual agreement, as I understand it, of the parties in response to comments or objections that were lodged. Specifically, certain revisions were made to the offense section, paragraphs 32 and 33.

The Court has also received the defendant's sentencing submission filed on December 3rd, 2021. That's filed at ECF 582. Together with that submission, there were roughly 100

pages of letters that were submitted in support of or on behalf of Mr. Navarro. And the Court has received the government's sentencing submission filed on December 10, 2021, that's filed at ECF 592, and it attaches Exhibits A through D. And I also have received a proposed order of restitution, which I'll discuss with the parties in a moment.

Certain portions of the government's submission were redacted in the version filed on ECF, but an unredacted version has been filed under seal. It's the Court's understanding -- well, I want to clarify. Are the exhibits under seal?

MS. MORTAZAVI: Yes, your Honor. The government has sought to file them under seal pursuant to the Court's protective order.

THE COURT: All of the exhibits?

MS. MORTAZAVI: That's correct.

THE COURT: Thank you.

And then, finally, the Court received on December 13th a letter from Mr. Navarro's counsel that is filed on the docket at ECF 594, and I also intend to discuss that further with you, Mr. Kreiss.

So let me confirm with each of the parties.

Mr. Kreiss, have you read and fully discussed that presentence report with Mr. Navarro?

MR. KREISS: Absolutely, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Navarro, have you read and reviewed

THE COURT: Mr. Kreiss.

MR. KREISS: No legal or factual objections, your

25 Honor.

24

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

As I said, I have a few questions I'd like to discuss before we proceed.

So Mr. Kreiss, first, the letter that you filed on December 13th, can you tell me, please, what that letter means.

MR. KREISS: Exactly what I said in the letter, your Honor. I inadvertently made an argument in my sentencing memorandum and it was made in error. And when I was made aware of it, I immediately contacted the government and sought to retract it.

THE COURT: What the Court would like to understand is are you stipulating to the 60-month sentencing guideline or are you reserving your right to argue still for a variance based on those same arguments?

MR. KREISS: No. And I want to make it very clear.

We are absolutely agreeing that the advisory guideline is 60 months, and I made that clear in my memorandum. I included an argument in error, I have retracted it. And yes, I'm seeking a variance from the 60 months, but having nothing to do with the issue of the three points for acceptance.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Is that acceptable to the government at this point?

MS. MORTAZAVI: Yes, your Honor. If the defendant intends to retract that argument, he's no longer in breach of the plea agreement.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Then I would also like to confirm with you,
Mr. Kreiss, that you have read and reviewed with Mr. Navarro
all of the proposed conditions of supervised release that are
set forth in the sentencing report.

MR. KREISS: We have reviewed the PSR in its entirety, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you specifically reviewed those proposed conditions?

MR. KREISS: We've gone over everything, your Honor.

THE COURT: So what I would like to confirm with you -- give me a moment to get the exact page -- those conditions fall into three categories, as I think you know, mandatory conditions are laid out on pages 37 and 38 of the report, the proposed standard conditions are on page 38 through 39 of the report, and then there are certain proposed special conditions on page 39.

Mr. Navarro, have you reviewed those with Mr. Kreiss?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And you understand them all?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Kreiss, the question I have for you is: Are you comfortable and is it acceptable to you for me to refer generically to those conditions as mandatory, standard and special conditions without putting anything specific in

that regard on the record?

MR. KREISS: Absolutely, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Finally, Ms. Mortazavi, does the government still agree -- particularly in light of our conversation so far this morning -- that Mr. Navarro is entitled to the two level reduction in the offense level calculation based on his, quote, clear acceptance of responsibility pursuant to Section 3E1.1A and a further one level reduction under Section 3E1.1B by reason of Mr. Navarro's timely notice of his intent to enter a plea?

MS. MORTAZAVI: Yes, your Honor. We agree that he's entitled to those acceptance points and that calculation was reflected in the parties' plea agreement.

THE COURT: The Court will grant the motion for that further one level reduction in the guidelines calculation.

So I would note for the record that the stipulated guidelines calculation is consistent with what is set forth in the presentence report. It is also, as I'll discuss in some detail in a moment, consistent with the Court's own calculation.

So at this time, I would like to give the parties the opportunity to address the Court. Before I do, I'm going to depart a little bit from what I usually do and give you my current sense of where I intend to come out today so that the

parties can address that when you speak to the Court, if you wish to do so.

So at this time, the Court is strongly inclined to sentence Mr. Navarro to the statutory maximum sentence of 60 months' imprisonment. As Mr. Navarro has acknowledged in his sentencing submission and as his counsel just acknowledged a few minutes ago -- well, he didn't acknowledge this part -- but the statutory maximum is lower than Mr. Navarro's calculated sentencing guideline range. And as such, under the guidelines is the guideline sentence. Taking into account the serious nature and circumstances of the offense, the history and characteristics of Mr. Navarro and all of the other sentencing factors under \$3553(a) as a whole, it is the Court's view that the statutory maximum of 60 months of imprisonment is the only sentence available that might provide a just outcome in this case.

Ms. Mortazavi, do you wish to address the Court?
MS. MORTAZAVI: Yes, your Honor.

I have a few remarks regarding the defendant's conduct, though I understand the Court's statements of a few minutes ago, and it seems that the Court is aligned with the government's view that the statutory maximum sentence, the stipulated guidelines range is appropriate here.

There have been, obviously, many papers filed in this case in relation to the litigation of this matter, as well as

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this sentencing proceeding and, in particular, many letters filed by the defendant. But if this Court wants a window into Jorge Navarro and how he viewed the horses under his control, then this Court should look to the communications that the defendant made in private with his trusted inner circle when he thought nobody was listening. When the defendant spoke with people who he believed were like him, who he believed shared his world view, the defendant spoke candidly about doping These were people like the defendant who abdicated their responsibilities to the horses that they were supposed to protect, people who treated horses as commodities to be used as a means to fame and riches and prestige, people who publicly claimed to love animals, but privately injected and tubed and electroshocked racehorses. These horses were pushed up to and beyond their natural abilities. Also, the defendant and those in his inner circle could maintain their own status, build their prestige and gain access to even more horses that they could dope and abuse. These are the hallmarks of the defendant's greed.

In public, the defendant perpetuated the fraudulent pretense that he loved his horses and that his success was due to his acumen as a horseman. And it was simply not true. In private, the defendant and those in his inner circle made jokes and made light of the defendant's prolific, callous, dangerous, fraudulent doping. They exchanged gifts of syringes that were

filled with dollar bills. They exchanged emojis of a monkey, a syringe, a horse, pills, all to reflect the defendant's most potent and preferred blood builder of choice, something that they called monkey.

Marcos Zulueta, an indicted coconspirator of the defendant's joked that if Jorge Navarro kept winning races, he would be arrested. To Navarro and his close friends, doping was a joke. It was a crime that he was able to perpetuate for years across multiple barns, across multiple states, involving dozens of racehorses. And because of Navarro's status as a trainer, he had unfettered opportunity to inject and drench and shock his horses with all manner of drugs for no medical purpose. And he did not do it alone.

I want to make brief mention, your Honor, of the letters of support that the defendant has submitted to the court, because those letters of support, frankly, are shocking. It is shocking for one of the defendant's supporters to suggest that he turned horses around because of TLC.

Navarro didn't train his horses due to any skill or compassion or talent. He relied on a bevy of drugs. He aggressively pursued any avenue of novel drugs from any source that he trusted to test out on his horses. He asked many others for tips on new drugs. And when he did so, he asked, did the drugs work. He didn't ask what was in them; he asked if they would work and if they would test, because that is what

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the defendant cared about. He did not care about the risk of injecting an unknown, unlabeled, unapproved substance into a horse. He did not care about the risk of accidently suffocating a horse by having a layperson drench the animal. He did not care about injecting a horse with a contaminated drug. He did not care about overdosing a horse. He did not care about pushing a horse so far beyond its natural limits that its heart literally stopped. Navarro only wanted to know if a drug would work and if it would test. And that much is apparent from defendant's conversations with others, where he discussed a steroid that caused horses to sweat uncontrollably, a new pain injection so potent that it caused four horses to die, and drenching by one of his friends that, if administered incorrectly, could be funneled into a horse's lungs and cause that horse to drown. Navarro cared about winning and not getting caught.

What else is shocking about those letters are the number of statements that recite Navarro's trainer statistics and professional accolades as a reflection of his character or his integrity or his skill as a trainer. Navarro's career as a racehorse trainer is a sham. It is built on an elaborate, sprawling, fraudulent scheme. And it is clear from those letters that even the people surrounding the defendant new a version of him that was built on lies. As a trainer, he was dishonest, unprincipled and dangerous. As these letters show,

the effects of Navarro's scheme are difficult to unravel.

It is also shocking to see the number of letters that point this court to Navarro's love of X Y Jet as an indication of the defendant's good character. X Y Jet was drugged with reckless abandon by the defendant in advance of races. That horse, having undergone three knee surgeries, when it appeared as if it would be unable to race a few days before a race at Gulfstream Park was still pushed beyond its limits to race and to win. At the thought that this horse would not be competitive at that claiming race or that it should not compete at all because it was too sick to do so, Navarro panicked and he invoked the people in his trusted inner circle to get drugs to force that horse to compete.

Across multiple races, Navarro used drugs from many others and the effects were apparent. X Y Jet, who appeared unable to compete at that race only a few days prior, won that race in what was described as an easy victory. And several weeks later at the Golden Shaheen race in Dubai, X Y Jet was once again drugged by Navarro and in that race was so far pushed past his limits that he won despite losing a shoe halfway through the race in the middle of the track.

It is shocking still, your Honor, that X Y Jet's veterinary surgeon would submit a letter to this court suggesting that Navarro didn't dope that horse because he never talked to Navarro about any elicit drugs. There's no doubt

that Navarro doped X Y Jet, and there's no doubt that he did so behind the back of this veterinary surgeon.

It is tragic, but ultimately unsurprising, that X Y

Jet at only eight years old died of a heart attack only two

weeks after his last race. He's a potent reminder of the

defendant's hypocrisy. And a reason why so many of these

letters are infected by the defendant's own fraud and the lies

that he perpetuated about his success.

Finally, your Honor, it is shocking the number of complicit, unindicted coconspirators who wrote letters of support for Navarro claiming he was a good trainer. This is not someone who cared about his horses. This was not someone who was particularly skilled. And these individuals had clear-eyed knowledge of Navarro's doping scheme and nonetheless wrote letters to this court intending to influence your sentence here today. This attitude is emblematic of those surrounding the defendant who helped perpetuate these crimes.

Your Honor, Navarro is notable because of his aggressive pursuit of novel drugs. It is very difficult to convey the breadth of all his conversations regarding his doping scheme. What is clear is that he pursued every avenue and he pursued it aggressively. And for that reason, your Honor, as the Court has indicated it is inclined to do, we ask that the Court impose the statutory maximum sentence of 60 months' imprisonment.

It is also for that reason, your Honor, that we have asked the Court to impose an additional special condition of the defendant's probation that would require the defendant to refrain from training and effectuate that limitation by compelling him to give up any of his state racing licenses and not apply for any new licenses during the term of his probation.

And if the Court has any questions about our submissions or any of the defendant's remarks in his submissions, I'm happy to address those.

THE COURT: I don't have any questions. Thank you.

Mr. Kreiss, would you like to be heard?

MR. KREISS: I would, your Honor. Thank you.

And certainly, your Honor, at this point, we don't make light of the gravity, the seriousness of this case. But Mr. Navarro stands here before you having pled guilty. He's accepted responsibility for his actions and does not seek to blame anyone for his conduct but himself.

At the change of plea hearing, Mr. Navarro, addressed the Court, gave a detailed admission, responded to the Court's questions, which were additionally very detailed. And the Court had inquired essentially what did you do and who did you do it with. And I've sat through a lot of change of plea hearings, a lot of sentencing hearings over the years and seen a lot of folks backpedal. There was no backpedaling.

Mr. Navarro has come in, he's accepted responsibility for his actions. And I'm not here to contest the allegations made in the government's remarks today.

The Court is saddled with a very difficult task, to make a determination, to determine what sentence is reasonable but not greater than necessary. We agree, the advisory guideline is 60 months, that's the starting point. And I understand the Court's initial statements, but we're asking the Court to consider a variance. We're asking the Court to consider Mr. Navarro's personal history and characteristics beyond his offense conduct. And that's what the Supreme Court has said in the progeny of many cases, essentially that the Court has to look at other factors. And certainly, I've read the letters, I have read the recent submissions, understand the government's remarks, but we are asking you to see

Mr. Navarro's personal history and characteristics from some of those who know him.

And I think one of the letters exemplifies this from Mr. John Koenig. He says, whatever flaws he has, I feel Jorge is at center good, compassionate and a caring human being.

Again, I recognize the serious nature of the offense. This is one of those cases where certainly a lot of folks in the public have reached out to the Court. This is a situation where Mr. Navarro -- he started from the bottom and was a skilled horseman. And he went wrong. And he admits his

conduct, makes absolutely no excuses. He's explained what became his reality. And he's here accepting responsibility for his actions.

Unfortunately, the pressure, the being away from his family -- and he's made the worst choices of his life. Those choices are going to haunt him for the rest of his natural life.

There is no concern about recidivism here. He will never be a licensed trainer in the United States ever again. He most likely won't remain in the United States.

But we're asking the Court, again, to consider his personal history and characteristics. I think it's important. A lot of cases, I've been in many sentencings where I look into the back of the courtroom and there's nobody there.

Mr. Navarro has his family here. They're spread out through the courtroom. His wife Jennifer, his daughter Taylor, his daughter Ashley, his son Christian, his sister, his sister

Ruth, his sister Diana, his niece Crystal, and his mom intended to be here, but unfortunately, she was hospitalized last week and wasn't well enough to make it up here. There are lots of situations where, in circumstances like this, there are no family members, there's absolutely no support. Mr. Navarro is lucky to have the folks that he has.

Again, Mr. Navarro is not here today, did not come in back in August to contest anything. He came in to accept

responsibility for his actions. As noted by probation and the government, he was one of the first people to come in and enter a plea publicly, which I would venture to say has had some affect on subsequent pleas in this case.

By entering his plea, he's aided the government and preserved resources of both the government and the court. He has satisfied the forfeiture of \$70,000, which is significant in this case. It was done timely. And Mr. Navarro has also been out on bond for, it's going to be 21 months now, and he's done everything he could do to comport and comply with the orders of this court. He's done nothing to show that he's failed to accept responsibility for his actions and certainly has not committed any new law or technical violations.

It's hard for the Court to recognize -- and I understand this -- there's a huge outpouring and there's an overwhelming amount of evidence in this case, but Mr. Navarro has admitted his conduct and he's not shirking his responsibilities. He's here, he's pled guilty. We're asking the Court to consider his personal history and characteristics.

And just briefly, I want to just mention a letter from his daughter. And I quote her as saying, "My father was always known to take the smaller people in, always giving someone a chance. My father was the type to help anyone out no matter what time it was. He always saw something in everyone. He always made sure everything and everyone was taken care of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

before he took care of himself."

And that statement is in contradiction to the way he acted in this case, and we recognize that. But we're asking the Court to see those qualities.

The Court must certainly impose a sentence that reflects the seriousness of the offense and respect for the law. A sentence of less than 60 months would be reasonable, but not greater than necessary.

This is a situation, Judge, where there's been so much publicity. Mr. Navarro was arrested in his home in front of his family, his neighbors. He's pled quilty to a federal felony offense. He is now labeled a convicted felon for the remainder of his life. He's lost his livelihood. And he's most likely going to be deported at the end of the day. A sentence of less than 60 months is not necessary to satisfy this prong. Quite frankly, any sentence at this point, after the government's actions. The prosecution in this case has sent a message and it's loud and clear. If you use adulterated This is a substances, you're going to be prosecuted federally. case that's been followed very, very closely by the industry media outlets, sometimes on a weekly and daily basis. And it's clear, if you utilize adulterated or misbranded substances, you're going to be prosecuted federally. The message is clear that this is not the end of this case.

And when the Court is considering a sentence that,

again, is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with that purpose, 60 months is not necessary. Mr. Navarro has been absent from horse racing now since the day he was arrested. He's not gone back to it. He's quite frankly not thought about going back to it. He lives in that environment, very close, and he's done, he's done. He stands here remorseful, contrite and only wishes he could roll back the hands of time, which we know is impossible. The only thing he can do is come in, accept his responsibility.

We're asking the Court to consider a sentence of 48 months, which we believe is sufficient, but not greater than necessary. The other co-defendants that have publicly pled, I believe, are facing statutory maximums of 36 months. And if the Court were to sentence Mr. Navarro today to 48 months, this would be essentially a third or a 33 percent increase from those other folks who have pled to statutory maximums of 36 months, assuming they didn't receive any variances. It's a significant percentage increase in his sentence above the others who the government has made clear that Mr. Navarro is more culpable. And a third or 33 percent increase in his sentence would be reasonable under these circumstances.

Mr. Navarro, because of his immigration status is likely to -- and I don't see any way that he would get the benefits that US citizens would get -- and this case is different than others, we're not asking the Court to give

Mr. Navarro a benefit because he did something unlawfully. If Mr. Navarro had entered the United States unlawfully recently and committed a crime and we were arguing his deportation is a further penalty, that would be very different than the situation here. He came here when he was 13 years old. Unfortunately, he was never naturalized.

But when he goes to prison, he will not go to a BOP prison camp. He will most likely go to a low facility. And those facilities, until very recently, we didn't have any in Florida. There has been a change in the administration to not utilize the private facilities. The closest recently was in Georgia. The hope is that Mr. Navarro would be designated to a facility in Florida to help facilitate family visitation. But he won't get the benefits of the RDAP program. If he were to qualify for the RDAP program like others in this case and in other cases —

THE COURT: Does Mr. Navarro have a drug problem?

MR. KREISS: He doesn't, your Honor. But if there

was, he wouldn't qualify for early release after participating

in the program. He doesn't get an early release to a halfway

house. He's not eligible because he's not a United States

citizen. Again, he's going to serve his sentence in a very

different environment. He's not going to go to a prison camp.

And at the end of the day, he's going to be deported.

Again, there's no blame being passed here. He takes

responsibility for his actions. But on top of this prison sentence, he's going to be most likely deported from this country. He's going to be separated from his family. Again, a situation that he's put himself in, and he takes responsibility, but a variable in his sentence that's different than others.

Based upon those factors, we ask the Court to consider a sentence of $48\ \mathrm{months}$.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Navarro, do you wish to address the Court?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: You can remain seated if it's easier for you, but please pull the microphone down so that the court reporter can hear you.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I would like to start off by apologizing to the Court, the government and most of all to my family and my racetrack family. I was introduced to the racetrack world at age 13 by my stepfather after coming to this incredible country to live a new life. I knew, as I got older, I wanted to become a trainer one day. I started from the bottom as a hot walker, groom, as an assistant trainer for many years. During my upbringing at the track, I also worked as a vet tech. I wanted to learn more about young horses, so I moved to Ocala to learn about training horses from an early stage. The reason I wanted to learn every aspect of horses was

because I wanted to have the knowledge of what it took to be known as the best trainer in this country.

Over the years, as time went by, I became that trainer that I prepared myself to be. What I didn't prepare myself for was how to handle the pressure from the winnings, the losing, the media, the owners and the negative backlash that comes from the racing world or the racetrack world.

I pushed my family aside and I was giving all my time to the sports that I love. I became hungry to be a winner. Somewhere along the way, the pressure started to get to me. I felt I had to win to become respected in the horse racing industry without thinking of the consequences I face today.

I started as a trainer working with horses that people gave up on, hoping one day I would be able to train top quality thoroughbreds. Your Honor, I became a selfish person who only cared about winning. I lost my way and betrayed my horses that I adore and love so much. They were what I truly loved most about being a trainer. They were by my side during my lonely days, my hard days and my happy days. I only wish I could go back in time and change the person I became.

I remember why I choose to be a trainer, which was my love for the horses. It was the horses that brought me my greatest joy.

Your Honor, I fully take responsibility for everything I have done. And I apologize again to all the people I hurt,

including my horses.

Now that I have spent two years away from the horses and the racetrack, I have realized that there was no need to change who I was as a horseman. I should have quit when I couldn't handle the pressure, rather than putting my horses, my family, my workers and the people who believe in me through all this. It certainly wasn't worth it now that I'm going to prison, facing deportation to a foreign country where I have no one. During this time away from the track, I have become a better man. I have had the time to make up for what my devotion to the racetrack life took away from me — took away from my kids and my family. My kids are seeing their father they knew they had. I'm enjoying things I took for granted while I was a trainer. But there's still one thing I miss, the horses.

Your Honor, this has been the hardest thing I have ever gone through and my family has ever gone through. My kids need me. I missed a lot of their time growing because of my love for the horse racing. And I know now I don't want to lose anymore time with my children and grandchildren.

I truly hope the industry changes to keep racehorses safe in the future. I know my conduct deserves to be punished, but I pray that you have mercy today. Thank you for allowing me to address the Court.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Navarro.

THE DEFENDANT: You're welcome, your Honor.

THE COURT: At this time, I will describe the sentence that I do intend to impose. The attorneys will have a final opportunity to make any legal objection before sentence is finally imposed.

Under the sentencing reform act of 1984 and governing Supreme Court precedence, I must consider the sentencing guidelines when determining a sentence. I must also, after calculating the applicable sentencing guideline range and properly considering that, I must consider any departures from that range and then I must consider the other sentencing factors under §3553(a).

In this case, the parties entered into a plea agreement with a stipulated guideline sentence of 60 months.

Probation reached the same sentencing guideline calculation. I too have also reached the same calculation relying on the uncontested facts in the PSR and the record before me.

I should note that the parties also agreed, in connection with Mr. Navarro's plea, that he would forfeit a total of \$70,000, which counsel has told me has been done. Mr. Navarro also agreed to pay restitution in the amount of \$25,860,514.

Briefly, let me just outline for the record my guidelines calculation. The guidelines provision in effect as of November 1, 2018 apply and govern in this case. With

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

respect to Count One, which charges Mr. Navarro with conspiracy to commit misbranding and drug adulteration with the intent to defraud or mislead to which Mr. Navarro pled quilty, the base level offense is six and that is regardless of whether we look under sentencing guidelines Section 2X1.1A, 2N2.1 or 2B1.1A2. 26 points or levels are added to that by reason of specific offense characteristics. Specifically, the base offense level is increased by 22 levels because the loss exceeded \$25 million. The offense level is increased by another two levels because the offense involved ten or more victims. And the offense level is increased by another two levels because a substantial part of the fraud was committed outside of the United States and otherwise involved sophisticated means. There's a further six point adjustment regarding Mr. Navarro's role in the offense. Two points are added because Mr. Navarro violated his duties under state licenses, abusing a position of trust. And a further four level increase applies because Mr. Navarro was the lead trainer with assistant trainers and vets and others acting at his direction.

The Court did apply, as did probation in its sentencing report, the three level reduction for acceptance of responsibility. That results in a total offense level of 35.

Although Mr. Navarro does have some prior criminal offenses, including a DUI, and I understand a domestic violence incident, his criminal history score is nonetheless zero, which results

in a criminal history category of I.

Based on these offense levels and criminal history calculations, Mr. Navarro's guideline sentencing range would be 168 to 210 months in prison.

However, the statutory maximum term of imprisonment for the offense to which he has pled guilty is five years. As a result, the guidelines dictate that that sentence of 60 months is the guideline sentence. The guidelines also provide a fine range of \$40,000 to \$250,000. And they provide for one to three years of supervised release for a class D felony.

Now, as I say, I have carefully considered the sentencing guidelines calculation and the various factors with respect to sentencing that are laid out in Title 18 United States Code §3553(a). At this point, I'd like to discuss or explain my consideration of those factors.

First, the crimes that Mr. Navarro committed are serious, they were dangerous, they were cold, and they were calculating. For years, you cheated, Mr. Navarro. And you effectively stole millions of dollars. You cheated other owners, trainers and jockeys against whom your horses competed.

At the time of your plea, you specifically admitted certain facts, both in writing in your plea agreement and then orally on the record in open court when I specifically asked you during your plea if the statements in the agreement were true and accurate. Among the facts you admitted are the

March 9, 2020, you administered and directed others, including veterinarians working at your direction, to administer nonFDA approved misbranded and adulterated drugs, including drugs intended to increase the performance of thoroughbred racehorses under your custody and care. Those drugs included blood building substances, vasodilators, imported and misbranded bronchodilators, bleeder pills, SGF 1000 and others. Each of those drugs were misbranded and/or adulterated, insofar as they were new animal drugs that had no FDA approval, they were administered to your horses with no valid prescription and/or they were manufactured in facilities without FDA registration. Among the horses to which you administered such drugs were the horses X Y Jet, War Story, Shancelot, and Nanoosh.

Among other incidents that are in the record before me, Mr. Navarro has admitted that he administered these drugs to X Y Jet, including blood building substances from in or about February 2019 through March of 2019 in order to enhance X Y Jet's performance at the allowance optional claiming race at Gulfstream Park in February of 2019 and at the Dubai Golden Shaheen race in the United Arab Emirates on March 30th of 2019.

In or about May of 2019, Mr. Navarro and one of the owners of Nanoosh agreed to continue administering such drugs to that horse in order to improve Nanoosh's racing performance.

Mr. Navarro admitted he participated in the interstate

shipment and distribution of nonFDA approved, misbranded and adulterated drugs. During the course of that scheme, he provided misbranded bronchodilator drugs to, among other people, the trainer, your co-defendant, Jason Servis. Among your means of evading detection of your unlawful scheme were the use of drugs that you believed would be untestable by racing officials. The coordination of the administration of those drugs with other trainers and vets in order to avoid physical detection by racetrack employees and racing authorities and the preparation in coordination with certain complicit veterinarians of false veterinary bills designed to deceive racing officials and/or racetrack employees who might demand proof of a valid course of veterinary care.

You further stipulated that, among other aggravating factors, the applicable intended loss amount at issue in this case was greater than \$25 million. Through this specific conduct, which you admitted, and through your multi-yearlong pattern of conduct reflected in the record before me, you have demonstrated, Mr. Navarro, a callous disregard for the well-being of the horses entrusted to your care. Bottom line, you likely killed and you certainly endangered horses in your care and potentially other horses competing in races you entered. You put at risk of serious physical injury or death the jockeys who rode the horses you drugged and perhaps horses competing against your horses.

Moreover, you bragged openly about what you were doing. You sent, as the government has outlined, text messages with emoji type images of monkeys, rockets, syringes, horses and pills clearly representing the drugs you were administering. And you received texts from an associate with an image of a syringe with the plunger pulled back filling it with dollar bills. You were so open and notorious and brazen about your crimes that you were dubbed the juice man. And you even kept in your barn a pair of crock style shoes that had the words "juice man" across the toes.

The record is very clear that, at the same time, you took steps to hide what you were doing from drug regulators and racing officials, and you went to great lengths to avoid detection. The scores of text messages and intercepted conversations reveal that the misbranded, unauthorized and adulterated performance-enhancing drugs were secretly administered, designed to be undetectable in drug tests and that you engaged in an escalating campaign to evade being caught.

You did not suffer from a momentary lapse in judgment or engage in a one-time abhorrent act. Rather, the evidence in this case and the facts which you admitted in connection with your plea make clear that you engaged in a multi-yearlong course of bad behavior that has impugned the integrity of the sport of horse racing that you profess to love.

I have carefully reviewed your sentencing submission several times and I've listened to your comments and the arguments of your counsel. While I do accept that you are remorseful and that you are sorry and that you wish you could turn back the clock, you said to me that you didn't think about the consequences that you were facing. You also didn't think about the consequences to the sport of horse racing or to the animals entrusted to your care.

There's nothing that I find in your sentencing submission that militates in favor of a variance in this case or anything that I believe justifies a below guidelines range sentence.

The letters submitted to me, along with your submission, make it clear that apparently you do have a close-knit, large, loving and supportive family. You immigrated to the United States from Panama when you were a teen, and you realized your family's hope and dream for a better life. Although your father was absent from your life, you were raised by a loving mother and stepfather, who apparently treated you as a naturally born son and taught you about horses and the horse racing industry and introduced you, as I understand it, to your chosen career as a horse trainer. You have no history of abuse, addiction, serious illness, no mental health or emotional problems.

The hundred pages of letters and emails of support

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that were submitted by you in connection with your sentencing submission paint a picture of a family man, a man of faith, a hard worker, a person who was willing to help those in need and who gave professional opportunities to people trying to find a way in this country or in your sport. Several characterize you as a father figure, big brother, a friend. All of these are admirable traits.

But I do have to say that, in all honesty, those letters taken collectively are not helpful to your cause. Ι note initially that many of the letters of support were submitted by individuals who appear to have been involved to various degrees in the wrongful conduct underlying your conviction. As importantly, many of the letters simply ignore reality and your own admissions of wrongdoing at the time of your plea. The people who wrote to the Court to provide character references or to suggest leniency tell the Court, one after the next, that you, quote, loved horses and the sport of horse racing, that you gave your horses, quote, "the best possible care." That you, quote, "made very good decisions for the safety and welfare of the animals." And quote, "that you always did what was best for your horses, " close quote, to quote just a few.

The reality is that someone who loves horses does not engage in the conduct that you engaged in or subject the animals you supposedly loved to cruel and dangerous drugs and

treatment. The letters characterize the time since your indictment as, quote, "unfair." They say that everything you lived for was, quote, "taken away," that your, quote, "livelihood was taken away." And that what, quote, "has been done to you is unfair and based on lies."

In reality, Mr. Navarro, no one did this to you. You did this to yourself. And you did it to the animals entrusted to your care and to the sport of horse racing.

I should also note, as Ms. Mortazavi did, that the Court also received a handful of emails and letters that were gratuitously sent to my chambers by individuals who urge a much harsher sentence. I've disclosed those communications to the government and to Mr. Navarro's counsel, and I have filed them or caused them to be filed on the docket in this case. I will tell you that those letters have not weighed in my fashioning of a sentence in this matter.

Now, I'm still somewhat confused, frankly, by counsel's arguments about acceptance of responsibility. I understand you're not seeking a departure and apparently you're telling me not a variance on the grounds that Mr. Navarro accepted responsibility or gave timely notice of an intent to plea. To have requested a departure on that grounds in the first place is wholly inappropriate, as you now seem to recognize. But neither does that argument, in the Court's view provide the basis for a variance. The theory underlying that

argument is simply incorrect. The three point reduction was applied to Mr. Navarro's guideline sentence and calculation.

And importantly -- and this is the reason I'm addressing this so everyone understands this point -- to Mr. Navarro's extreme benefit, not to his prejudice and not to his detriment, as you seem to be assuming, he is enjoying the benefits of a statutory maximum of five years on the time to which he is to be sentenced. You ignore the fact that the reason I am constrained by a five year statutory maximum is because the government allowed Mr. Navarro to plead guilty to only one of the two conspiracy counts charged in the indictment, charged against him in the indictment. If he had been convicted at trial on those two counts, he faced ten years in prison for the two charged counts.

Moreover, in connection with Mr. Navarro's plea, the government agreed not to pursue other possible charges against him for his conduct. And those other possible charges could well have exposed him to further prison time. So for example, if he had been charged with wire and mail fraud, the penalties for those offenses are far greater than the five year statutory maximum. So he is, in reality, reaping a significant benefit from his timely plea and his acceptance of responsibility.

I would just remind everyone that Mr. Navarro swore to me at his change of plea hearing that he pleaded guilty because he was in fact guilty, not because he was promised anything. I

repeatedly warned Mr. Navarro that I could impose any sentence up to the statutory maximum and that nobody, including the government, could promise him less and that he could not take back his plea if he were disappointed with the sentence that would be imposed.

Now, while at the same time saying he accepts responsibility and he expresses remorse, which I believe is sincere and genuine, you ask on his behalf and, Mr. Navarro, you point to pressure, outside pressures from owners and from the industry I guess in an attempt to explain your conduct. If you were pressured, it was because you chose to work with and for people who were complicit in a cruel and fraudulent sector of the racing business. And there's evidence before the Court that you were pretty pleased with your choices and proud of the results you achieved until you got caught.

You have also made a second argument asking for leniency based on immigration consequences of your conviction. You argue that you're almost certain to be deported which means separation from your family and incarceration beyond the term of imprisonment at an ICE facility.

According to the PSR, you are in this country legally as a permanent resident with a Green Card. I do not think any of the potential immigration consequences weighs heavily in favor of leniency here.

You told probation, Mr. Navarro, that you came to this

country in 1987 to live the immigration dream. In this country, the American dream is that through hard work one might have amazing opportunities. You achieved that dream. I do believe, contrary to what the government says, that you actually are a talented and skilled horse trainer. But somewhere along the way, you got greedy and you chose to cheat.

I warned you at the time of your plea that there could be immigration consequences to pleading guilty. And I specifically asked you and you assured me that you had discussed those consequences with your attorney and you waived any challenge to your conviction and sentence based on immigration consequences regardless of the advice you received about the immigration consequences of your plea.

I have carefully balanced your early plea and your expressions of remorse and your professed acceptance of responsibility coupled with your personal characteristics against the seriousness of your conduct and your relative culpability in the charged conspiracies. You enjoyed and you abused a position of trust. And you were a leader of the alleged conspiracies, central to the conspiracies pled in the indictment. You were the lead trainer in your barn, and you directed the actions and conduct of many people, those who worked for you and at your direction and others.

The number of victims of your fraud and the magnitude of the intended loss attributable to your conduct is enormous.

Finally, while I have considered the 3553(a) factors, it's appropriate for me to note specifically that in determining the appropriate sentence, the statute directs me to impose a sentence sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes of sentencing, which include to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, to provide just punishment for the offense, to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, and to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant.

As we have discussed, I am constrained in this case by the statutory maximum of 60 months' imprisonment. I would impose a longer sentence if the law allowed. But as reflected in the statute, Congress has determined that 60 months is sufficient.

Having carefully considered the facts of this case and the purposes of sentencing, I find that sentence is not greater than necessary to serve the legitimate purposes of sentencing set forth in Title 18 United States Code \$3553(a). A sentence of 60 months is necessary to send a strong message to participants in the horse racing industry that abuse of the animals entrusted to their care, defrauding racing and drug regulators, stealing from and jeopardizing the safety of other racing participants will not be tolerated and will result in serious consequences.

Contrary to what Mr. Kreiss has argued, the threat of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

prosecution alone is not enough. A guideline sentence is necessary to afford deterrence to criminal conduct both by the defendant before me today and by others in the racing industry. That sentence is also necessary to promote respect for the rule of law and to provide just punishment, Mr. Navarro, for your conduct.

So as I have said, it is the Court's intent to sentence Mr. Navarro to 60 months of imprisonment followed by three years of supervised release with the mandatory and special conditions that are set forth in the PSR that we talked about earlier. In addition, the following special conditions will apply to the term of supervised release: Mr. Navarro must provide the probation officer with access to any requested financial information. You must not incur new credit charges or open any additional lines of credit without approval of the probation officer unless you're in compliance with the installment payment schedules that we need to talk about with regard to the forfeiture order in this case. You must obey the immigration laws and comply with the directives of immigration authorities. If the probation officer determines, based on your criminal record, personal history or characteristics that you pose a risk to another person, including any organization, the probation officer, with the prior approval of the Court, may require you to notify the person about the risk, and you must comply with that instruction. The probation officer may

contact that person and confirm that you have provided notice about the risk.

I am not going to impose the additional special condition requested by the government that you be banned from horse racing and that you not apply for further license. I am, however, continuing or imposing as a condition of your supervised release the condition that I added to the bail conditions for all defendants in this case. So Mr. Navarro, while on supervised release, you must comply with the rules and regulations of any licensing regime to which you are or may be subject, including appearances at any proceedings, disciplinary or otherwise, if required, consistent with any constitutional rights, and you will abide by the licensing regulations in effect at the time and the decisions of the individual licensing authorities to whom any application is made.

There is, in addition, a \$100 mandatory special assessment payable immediately.

In this case, restitution is mandatory. And Mr. Navarro and the government have stipulated to the amount of restitution. I have been given a copy of a proposed order of restitution, which includes the stipulated amount of \$25,860,514, which is payable to the victims of the offense charged in Count One of the indictment.

Mr. Navarro's liability for that restitution is joint and several with that of any other defendant ordered to make

1 restitution for the offenses charged in Count One.

The Court will enter the order that has been handed up to me. Mr. Kreiss, I assume you have seen this?

MR. KREISS: Absolutely, your Honor. I have reviewed it with Mr. Navarro.

THE COURT: And this is on consent?

MR. KREISS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The Court will enter that order. But as I say, I do wish to speak with the parties further about the schedule attached to that order, which is the schedule of victims. The government has filed that schedule of victims under seal, as is often customary.

Ms. Mortazavi, I do have a question for you. Is it your position that the categories of those victims is confidential and needs to be under seal or just the individual identities of the victims and the amounts to which each is entitled?

MS. MORTAZAVI: The categories are not under seal, your Honor. It is the particulars of each victim and what they are owed. And the Court is correct that typically this is filed under seal, including when it involves entities such as banking institutions.

THE COURT: Are you prepared to talk to me on the open record about the categories of victims?

MS. MORTAZAVI: Certainly, your Honor.

THE COURT: Why don't I reserve that to the very end, and let me finish with the sentence I intend to impose and actually imposing the sentence, and then we'll discuss the specifics of restitution.

MS. MORTAZAVI: Very good.

THE COURT: In addition to restitution, Mr. Navarro has stipulated to forfeiture in the amount of \$70,000. I understand that that amount has already been paid; is that correct?

MR. KREISS: Yes, there was a wire sent to the United States marshal service.

THE COURT: And the Court previously entered the preliminary order of forfeiture.

Ms. Mortazavi, have you confirmed that that amount was received?

MS. MORTAZAVI: That's correct, your Honor. And that amount was received prior to today.

THE COURT: Finally, with respect to a fine, the guidelines do say that the Court shall impose a fine unless the defendant is unable to pay. In this case, based on the information found by probation and the information set forth in the PSR, I do find that after forfeiture and restitution are paid, Mr. Navarro is unlikely to be able to pay any fine, and I therefore am not going to impose a fine.

Does the government know of any legal reason that the

sentence may not be imposed?

MS. MORTAZAVI: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Kreiss, does the defense know of any legal reason that this sentence may not be imposed?

MR. KREISS: No legal reason, your Honor.

THE COURT: No objections?

MR. KREISS: No objections.

THE COURT: Mr. Navarro, would you please stand.

It is the judgment of the Court, Mr. Navarro, that you be sentenced to a term of incarceration of 60 months.

I will say, we haven't talked about this and there wasn't any comment about this, but Mr. Navarro, in light of the fact that next week is the Christmas holiday, I do understand that you have young children, you have been compliant with the terms of your release pending sentence, I do find that Mr. Navarro is a candidate for voluntary surrender, and so I am not going to be directing that you be taken into custody today.

You're directed to voluntarily surrender on

January 18th at a facility to be designated by the Bureau of

Prisons. I did consult with probation before today about this

timing. And counsel will obviously be in touch with the people

who make these decisions about designating the facility. And

you'll be in touch with the Court if there's a need.

I also sentence you to a term of supervised release of three years, subject to the mandatory and standard conditions

in the PSR and the special conditions that I have just put on the record.

You must pay a special mandatory assessment of \$100 for the count to which you pled guilty. I do find that you are unable to pay a fine after you fulfill your obligations for forfeiture and restitution, and therefore, I am not imposing a fine in this case.

I will, as I said, sign the order of restitution directing that you shall pay restitution in the total amount of \$25,860,514 to the victims of the offense charged in Count One of the indictment. That obligation is joint and several with any other defendant ordered to make restitution for the offense charged in Count One of the indictment.

You may be seated, sir.

Mr. Kreiss, I understand that you have requested and the Court will ask that Mr. Navarro be designated for a facility as close as possible to Florida. I believe you said South Florida.

MR. KREISS: I think if the recommendation just states a facility as close to South Florida as possible.

THE COURT: Does not Mr. Navarro live in Ocala?

MR. KREISS: He's in Ocala and actually the facilities would be in the middle district. So a facility as close to his family to aid in visitation I think would be appropriate.

THE COURT: The Court will request that that

designation be made.

Is the government moving at this time to dismiss any open counts against Mr. Navarro?

MS. MORTAZAVI: Yes, your Honor. We move to dismiss the open counts in the S6 indictment and in the original indictment.

THE COURT: Any open counts in the S6 indictment and in the original indictment against Mr. Navarro will be dismissed at this time.

Mr. Navarro, I would like to advise you that to the extent you have not waived that right in the plea agreement, you have the right to appeal from your conviction and from your sentence. If you are unable to pay the costs of an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. The notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of the judgment of conviction, which we will finalize as promptly as possible and file it in this case.

Let me turn to the question that the Court has with -- Mr. Kreiss, did you have something?

MR. KREISS: I would ask for one concession, if the Court would consider it, I have spoken with the government, and we would respectfully ask the Court to consider a 60-day surrender, if the Court would permit. This is a significant sentence, and due to the permanency of the resolution of this case and Mr. Navarro going into custody, just so he can be with

his family and get his affairs in order.

THE COURT: Ms. Mortazavi.

MS. MORTAZAVI: The government does not object and agrees with the Court's assessment that he is a good candidate for voluntary self-surrender.

THE COURT: The Court will grant the request. I will tell you in all candor that I said that I had spoken with probation. I directed the 30 days, which probation told me they needed that at the absolute minimum. I do know from experience that it is taking longer than the 30 days for a facility to be designated, sometimes it takes as long as 90 days. So the Court will grant the request for voluntary surrender 60 days from today at whatever facility is designated. If one is not designated by that time -- that's what I was alluding to earlier -- obviously, counsel will come back to the Court and will make whatever arrangements have to be made.

MR. KREISS: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, as I said, I'd like to talk about restitution.

Ms. Mortazavi, the general category of victims you have identified for the record, please.

MS. MORTAZAVI: The general categories are various racetracks that paid out funds to Navarro that never should have been paid.

THE COURT: Mr. Kreiss, you need to listen to this.

Say it again, Ms. Mortazavi.

MS. MORTAZAVI: The general categories of victims, your Honor, that are entitled to restitution are the racetracks that paid purse winnings to Navarro for Navarro-trained horses that won races that never should have received purse winnings because they were dosed.

THE COURT: That's different than what you said a minute ago, but --

MS. MORTAZAVI: Certainly.

THE COURT: The question the Court has is the following: Have you discussed with Mr. Kreiss who the victims are?

MS. MORTAZAVI: We provided Mr. Kreiss with this schedule of victims prior to today's proceeding. He has seen it and I assume reviewed it with the defendant.

THE COURT: The question the Court has is the following -- and really, Ms. Mortazavi, it keys off of how you first formulated to me, before I told Mr. Kreiss to pay closer attention -- you said, the racetracks who paid out purse money that they shouldn't have paid. What it seems to the Court and the reason I have a question is it seems to me that each of these racetracks would have paid the purse regardless of Mr. Navarro's doping of the horses. It just would have paid the purse to somebody other than Mr. Navarro and the other

horses -- actually, they pay it to the owner, I think, and Mr. Navarro gets a share; correct?

MS. MORTAZAVI: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: The tracks would have paid out that money regardless. So the question I have is how are the tracks the victims and not the owners of the horses who came in second, third, fourth and actually fifth, since the fifth place horse would have been fourth, and as I understand it, a fourth place horse shares in the purse; correct?

MS. MORTAZAVI: I understand the Court's concern. And as a practical and legal --

THE COURT: It's a question more than a concern.

MS. MORTAZAVI: Certainly. The Court's question on this is well taken and something that the government has considered. As a practical and legal matter, the racetracks are going to end up being the clearinghouse for claims.

THE COURT: I understand that.

MS. MORTAZAVI: By these other competitors for the purse winnings that they believe they are entitled to and are now legally entitled to because of the defendant's admissions. So this was the most practical resolution of attempts to get these monies back to those competitors.

THE COURT: I do understand. And frankly, that's part of what I have been pondering. I imagine it's not an impossible task. You have obviously identified the races

involved or you couldn't have identified the racetracks and the appropriate amounts, so you know the races that were implicated here. It's not a particularly difficult task to figure out who came in second, third, fourth and fifth, and you could get that from the charts and other online databases and certainly the racetracks would have it. But by what you are doing, you are placing a burden now on these racetracks to go back and recalculate everything.

Have you been in touch with these tracks?

MS. MORTAZAVI: The tracks are aware of our case. We have obviously been in contact with them throughout this case.

THE COURT: But are they aware of your intent to put this burden on them?

MS. MORTAZAVI: I believe, your Honor, that burden is going to shift to them because the other competitors are going to go to the racetracks, in any event, to attempt to receive these funds. They wouldn't be able to go to the government in the first instance for these funds because we won't have them in our possession. So in a way, this is bridging the gap, because competitors will be turning to the racetracks, as I mentioned, in any event, following today's proceeding. And this will provide a mechanism by which the racetracks can rectify the wrongs that have been caused.

THE COURT: Any comment from you, Mr. Kreiss?

MR. KREISS: No.

THE COURT: The Court will enter the consensual order of restitution, then. It does appear that you have thought through the logistics. The only piece of it that I think isn't factored in is the additional cost and expense and burden on the tracks, but I suppose that is part of the cost of doing business.

Thank you, Ms. Mortazavi.

MS. MORTAZAVI: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Before we depart, there are two orders of business.

Mr. Navarro, I would just like to speak to you directly. I take to heart your comments that you have used this period of time since your indictment to really do some serious soul searching, to try to become a better man, to try to go back to what people have painted you once were. I just implore you to use this time that you are incarcerated to continue that journey, to think about what you're going to do productively once you're released from prison and to continue to strive to be the best person that you can be under the circumstances.

I thank our court reporter for being with us today. It's been a rather long proceeding, but thank you.

Is there any other business, Ms. Mortazavi?

MS. MORTAZAVI: Nothing further. Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Kreiss.

```
1
               MR. KREISS: Nothing further, your Honor.
2
               THE COURT: Thank you.
3
               Best wishes to you, Mr. Navarro. It's odd to say
 4
      under the circumstances, but I wish everyone as happy a holiday
5
      and as merry a Christmas and a good new year as you can have.
6
      Thank you. We're adjourned.
 7
               (Adjourned)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```